

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claim 1, 11 and 16 have been amended. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite that any video frame may be selected by the viewer to be manipulated, and furthermore, that the file storing the manipulated video frame and interest points is stored after the video frame has been manipulated. No new matter has been added. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated December 13, 2006 in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-5, 9, 11 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,408,128 B1 issued to Abecassis, which describes “capabilities and environments that automatically customize the playing of videos to satisfy the particular video requirement of each of a plurality of viewers, and that deliver to each viewer a more enjoyable video experience without requiring the level of active participation inherent in interactive systems, the use of personal computers, and/or by primitive consumer electronic products. (Abecassis column 1 lines 46-53).” It is respectfully submitted that the automatic method of Abecassis is clearly designed such that viewer involvement in creating a customized video presentation is significantly reduced. At the same time, the editing options available to the viewer are substantially limited.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 recites a combination of limitations not taught by Abecassis. Claim 1 is recited below for reference:

A method for enabling a viewer to create a customized video presentation from one or more preexisting digital video titles, the method comprising:

selecting any video frame from the one or more preexisting digital video titles;

selecting one or more interest points in the video frame;

manipulating the one or more interest points in the associated video frame;
and

storing a file on a digital video disc (DVD) after manipulating the one or more interest points in the associated video frame, said file storing the manipulated video frame and having identifiers for relating the manipulated video frame and the one or more interest points to the one or more preexisting digital video titles.

The Office Action asserts that Abecassis teaches “storing a file on a digital video disc (column 27, lines 31-43), said file storing the manipulated video frame and having identifiers for relating the manipulated video frame and one or more interest points to the one or more preexisting digital video titles (column 60 lines 18-31, column 21 line 56-column 22 line 5, and column 5 lines 8-10,” the file being a video map. However, it is respectfully submitted that the video map taught by Abecassis simply “comprises the various segment combinations that are defined (column 21 lines 32-33)” in a variable content video. Cited column 27, lines 31-43 recite “Specifically in a DVD implementation the video map or navigation data is included in a digital format and the video content is included in a digital compressed format in one or more spiral tracks.” It is respectfully submitted that the cited section merely describes an embodiment in which the video map having the predefined segments chosen by the editor is included by the editor on DVD. Nowhere does Abecassis teach that the viewer stores the file/video map created by manipulating preexisting digital video titles. In contrast, according to Abecassis, the segments comprising the video map are predefined and stored by the editor of the variable content video, who is not to be confused with the viewer/user, prior to viewer use.

According to Abecassis, the viewer simply chooses his preferences from a video preferences list already available on the variable content video, which includes video content categories, and the system automatically chooses video segments to match the viewer’s preferences. Thus, the viewer’s viewing options are limited by the video map produced and provided by the editor of the variable content video. More particularly, only the video frames or segments of video frames chosen by the editor and stored in the video map may be manipulated.

A viewer is defined in Abecassis column 4 lines 35-42: “The term ‘viewer’ as used herein is meant to include and be interchangeable with the words ‘player’, ‘subscriber’, and ‘user.’ That is, the term ‘viewer’ is to be understood in the general sense of a person passively viewing a video, interactively playing a video game, retrieving video from a video provider, and/or actively using multimedia, internet, and/or communication services.”

In contrast, the present invention provides means for a viewer/user to edit any video frame in one or more preexisting digital titles. The viewer may modify or manipulate points of interest (via zoom, pan, brightness control, addition of text, etc.) and subsequently store his or her modified video frames for later viewing. The viewer’s modifications are reconfigurable and may be permanently stored in one of a variety of storage means consistent with the specification,

including a DVD. Thus, in contrast to Abecassis, **the viewer's editing options are not limited by predefined segments stored by the editor on the DVD or other variable content video.** More particularly, the method recited in claim 1 allows for the manipulation of **any** video frame as well as the storage of any video frame **after** manipulation.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Abecassis does not disclose all of the elements recited in claim 1, and hence, claim 1 is not anticipated by Abecassis. Withdraw of the 35 USC 102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

A number of the claims were also rejected under Abecassis in view of US 2002/0018136 A1 issued to Kaji et al, which describes an image pickup device including an image processing apparatus "provided with an electronic zooming device for electronically enlarging the image around a selected position in the image area (See Abstract)." It is respectfully submitted that nothing in Kaji cures the fundamental deficiencies of Abecassis. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that no reasonable modification of Abecassis and Kaji can be used to construct the present invention.

Independent claims 11, and 16 recite limitations similar in scope to those recited in claim 1, and are, therefore, respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons discussed above for claim 1.

All dependent claims depend directly or indirectly on the independent claims, and are, therefore respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons presented above for the independent claims. Additionally, these dependent claims recited additional elements or limitations that when considered in the context of the present invention, further patentably distinguish the art of record.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct such fees from Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. GENSP029).

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Michael J. Ferrazano/
Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001